

SAMUEL MULTIPLICITIES AND BROWDER SPECTRUM OF OPERATOR MATRICES

SHIFANG ZHANG AND JUNDE WU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we first point out that the necessity of Theorem 4 in [8] does not hold under the given condition and present a revised version with a little modification. Then we show that the definitions of some classes of semi-Fredholm operators, which use the language of algebra and first introduced by X. Fang in [8], are equivalent to that of some well-known operator classes. For example, the concept of shift-like semi-Fredholm operator on Hilbert space coincide with that of upper semi-Browder operator. For applications of Samuel multiplicities we characterize the sets of $\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_{ab}(M_C)$, $\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_{sb}(M_C)$ and $\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_b(M_C)$, respectively, where $M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$ denotes a 2-by-2 upper triangular operator matrix acting on the Hilbert space $H \oplus K$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, let H and K be separable infinite dimensional complex Hilbert spaces and $B(H, K)$ the set of all bounded linear operators from H into K , when $H = K$, we write $B(H, H)$ as $B(H)$. For $A \in B(H)$, $B \in B(K)$ and $C \in B(K, H)$, we have $M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} \in B(H \oplus K)$. For $T \in B(H, K)$, let $R(T)$ and $N(T)$ denote the range and kernel of T , respectively, and denote $\alpha(T) = \dim N(T)$, $\beta(T) = \dim K/R(T)$. If $T \in B(H)$, the ascent $asc(T)$ of T is defined to be the smallest nonnegative integer k which satisfies that $N(T^k) = N(T^{k+1})$. If such k does not exist, then the ascent of T is defined as infinity. Similarly, the descent $des(T)$ of T is defined as the smallest nonnegative integer k for which $R(T^k) = R(T^{k+1})$ holds. If such k does not exist, then $des(T)$ is defined as infinity, too. If the ascent and the descent of T are finite, then they are equal (see [3]). For $T \in B(H)$, if $R(T)$ is closed and $\alpha(T) < \infty$, then T is said to be a upper semi-Fredholm operator, if $\beta(T) < \infty$, which implies that $R(T)$ is closed, then T is said to be a lower semi-Fredholm operator. If $T \in B(H)$ is either upper or lower semi-Fredholm operator, then T is said to

2000 Mathematical Subject Classification. Primary 47A10; Secondary 47A53.

Key words and phrases. Samuel multiplicities, Operator matrices, Upper semi-Browder operator, Upper semi-Browder spectrum, Browder operator, Browder spectrum.

This work is supported by the NSF of China (Grant Nos. 10771034 and 10771191).

be a semi-Fredholm operator. If both $\alpha(T) < \infty$ and $\beta(T) < \infty$, then T is said to be a Fredholm operator. For a semi-Fredholm operator T , its index $\text{ind}(T)$ is defined by $\text{ind}(T) = \alpha(T) - \beta(T)$.

In this paper, the sets of invertible operators, left invertible operators and right invertible operators on H are denoted by $G(H)$, $G_l(H)$ and $G_r(H)$, respectively, the sets of all Fredholm operators, upper semi-Fredholm operators and lower semi-Fredholm operators on H are denoted by $\Phi(H)$, $\Phi_+(H)$ and $\Phi_-(H)$, respectively, the sets of all Browder operators, upper semi-Browder operators and lower semi-Browder operators on H are defined, respectively, by

$$\Phi_b(H) := \{T \in \Phi(H) : \text{asc}(T) = \text{des}(T) < \infty\},$$

$$\Phi_{ab}(H) := \{T \in \Phi_+(H) : \text{asc}(T) < \infty\},$$

$$\Phi_{sb}(H) := \{T \in \Phi_-(H) : \text{des}(T) < \infty\}.$$

Moreover, for $T \in B(H)$, we introduce its corresponding spectra as following [19]:

the spectrum: $\sigma(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin G(H)\}$,

the left spectrum: $\sigma_l(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin G_l(H)\}$,

the right spectrum: $\sigma_r(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin G_r(H)\}$,

the essential spectrum: $\sigma_e(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin \Phi(H)\}$,

the upper semi-Fredholm spectrum: $\sigma_{SF+}(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin \Phi_+(X)\}$,

the lower semi-Fredholm spectrum: $\sigma_{SF-}(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin \Phi_-(X)\}$,

the Browder spectrum: $\sigma_b(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin \Phi_b(H)\}$,

the upper semi-Browder spectrum: $\sigma_{ab}(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin \Phi_{ab}(X)\}$,

the lower semi-Browder spectrum: $\sigma_{sb}(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : T - \lambda I \notin \Phi_{sb}(X)\}$.

For a semi-Fredholm operator $T \in B(H)$, its shift Samuel multiplicity $s_mul(T)$ and backward shift Samuel multiplicity $b.s_mul(T)$ are defined ([5-8]), respectively, by

$$s_mul(T) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta(T^k)}{k},$$

$$b.s_mul(T) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha(T^k)}{k}.$$

Moreover, it has been proved that $s_mul(T), b.s_mul(T) \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$ and $\text{ind}(T) = b.s_mul(T) - s_mul(T)$. These two invariants refine the Fredholm index and can be regarded as the stabilized dimension of the kernel and cokernel [8].

Definition 1.1 ([8]). A semi-Fredholm operator $T \in B(H)$ is called a pure shift semi-Fredholm operator if T has the form $T = U^n P$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or $n = \infty$, U is the unilateral

shift, and P is a positive invertible operator. Analogously, T is called a pure backward shift semi-Fredholm operator if its adjoint T^* is a pure shift semi-Fredholm operator. Here U^∞ denotes the direct sum of countably (infinite) many copies of U .

Definition 1.2 ([8]) A semi-Fredholm operator $T \in B(H)$ is called a shift-like semi-Fredholm operator if $b.s.\text{-}mul(T) = 0$; T is called a shift semi-Fredholm operator if $N(T) = 0$. Analogous concepts for backward shifts can also be defined. T is called a stationary semi-Fredholm operator if $b.s.\text{-}mul(T) = 0$ and $s\text{-}mul(T) = 0$.

It follows from Definition 1.1 that T is a shift semi-Fredholm operator iff T is a left invertible operator, and that T is a backward shift semi-Fredholm operator iff T is a right invertible operator.

In ([8], Theorem 4 and Corollary 18), Fang gave the following 4×4 upper-triangular representation theorem: An operator $T \in B(H)$ is semi-Fredholm iff T can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3 \oplus H_4$,

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & * & * & * \\ 0 & T_2 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & T_3 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & T_4 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim H_4 < \infty$, T_1 is a pure backward shift semi-Fredholm operator, T_2 is invertible, T_3 is a pure shift semi-Fredholm operator, T_4 is a finite nilpotent operator. Moreover, $\text{ind}(T_1) = b.s.\text{-}mul(T)$ and $\text{ind}(T_3) = -s\text{-}mul(T)$.

The following example shows that the representation theorem is not accurate.

Example 1.3. Let H be the direct sum of countably many copies of $\ell^2 := \ell^2(\mathbf{N})$, that is, the elements of H are the sequences $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ with $x_j \in \ell^2$ and $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|x_j\|^2 < \infty$. Let V be the unilateral shift on ℓ^2 , i.e.,

$$V : \ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^2, \quad \{z_1, z_2, \dots\} \mapsto \{0, z_1, z_2, \dots\},$$

and the operators T_1 and T_3 be defined by

$$T_1 : H \rightarrow H, \quad \{x_1, x_2, \dots\} \mapsto \{V^*x_1, V^*x_2, \dots\}$$

and

$$T_3 : H \rightarrow H, \quad \{x_1, x_2, \dots\} \mapsto \{Vx_1, Vx_2, \dots\}.$$

Now, we consider the operator

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ 0 & T_3 \end{pmatrix} : H \oplus H \rightarrow H \oplus H.$$

Note that T_1 is a pure backward shift semi-Fredholm operator, T_3 is a pure shift semi-Fredholm operator, so T satisfies the conditions of Fang's 4×4 triangular representation theorem, but, since $\alpha(T_1) = \alpha(T) = \beta(T) = \dim(H/R(T_3)) = \infty$, so T is not a semi-Fredholm operator.

Now, we can prove the following improved 4×4 upper-triangular representation theorem:

Theorem 1.4. An operator $T \in B(H)$ is semi-Fredholm iff T can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3 \oplus H_4$,

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & * & * & * \\ 0 & T_2 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & T_3 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & T_4 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim H_4 < \infty$, T_1 is a pure backward shift semi-Fredholm operator, T_2 is invertible, T_3 is a pure shift semi-Fredholm operator and $\min\{\text{ind}(T_1), -\text{ind}(T_3)\} < \infty$, T_4 is a finite nilpotent operator. Moreover,

- (1) $\text{ind}(T_1) = b.s.\text{-}mul(T)$, $\text{ind}(T_3) = -s.\text{-}mul(T)$;
- (2) $\text{ind}(T) = +\infty$ iff $\text{ind}(T_1) = +\infty$;
- (3) $\text{ind}(T) = -\infty$ iff $\text{ind}(T_3) = -\infty$;
- (4) $\text{ind}(T)$ is finite iff both of $\text{ind}(T_1)$ and $\text{ind}(T_3)$ are finite.

Theorem 1.4 can be described as 3×3 triangular representation form which may be more convenient for the study of operator theory, that is,

Theorem 1.5. An operator $T \in B(H)$ is semi-Fredholm if and only if T can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3$

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{12} & T_{13} \\ 0 & T_2 & T_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & T_3 \end{pmatrix} : H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3 \rightarrow H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus H_3,$$

where $\dim H_3 < \infty$, T_1 is a right invertible operator, T_3 is a finite, nilpotent operator, T_2 is a left invertible operator, and $\min\{\text{ind}(T_1), -\text{ind}(T_2)\} < \infty$. Moreover, $\text{ind}(T_1) = \alpha(T_1) = b.s.\text{-}mul(T)$, $\text{ind}(T_2) = -\beta(T_2) = -s\text{-}mul(T)$ and $\text{ind}(T) = \alpha(T_1) - \beta(T_2)$.

The next lemma is useful for the proofs of our results below, especially in Section 2.

Lemma 1.6 [19]. Let $A \in B(H)$, $B \in B(K)$ and $C \in B(K, H)$.

- (1) If $A \in \Phi_b(H)$, then $B \in \Phi_{ab}(K)$ iff $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$.
- (2) If $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$, then $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$.
- (3) If $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$ and $B \in \Phi_{ab}(K)$, then $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$ for any $C \in B(K, H)$.
- (4) If $B \in \Phi_b(K)$, then $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$ iff $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$;
 $A \in \Phi_{sb}(H)$) iff $M_C \in \Phi_{sb}(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$.
- (5) If $M_C \in \Phi_b(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$, then $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$ and $B \in \Phi_{sb}(K)$.
- (6) If two of A , B and M_C are Browder, then so is the third.

Proposition 1.7. Let $T \in B(H)$. Then T is upper semi-Browder iff T can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$,

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{12} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim(H_1) < \infty$, T_1 is nilpotent, T_2 is left invertible, and $\beta(T_2) = s\text{-}mul(T) = -\text{ind}(T)$.

Proof. Necessity. Suppose that T is upper semi-Browder. Then we can assume $p = \text{asc}(T) < \infty$. Let $H_1 = N(T^p)$. Note that T is upper semi-Fredholm, so $\dim H_1 < \infty$. Let $H = H_1 \oplus H_1^\perp$, we have

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{12} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} : H_1 \oplus H_1^\perp \rightarrow H_1 \oplus H_1^\perp.$$

That T_1 is nilpotent is clear. Moreover, since the fact that $\dim H_1 < \infty$ implies $T_1 \in \Phi_b(H_1)$, it follows from Lemma 1.6 (1) that $T_2 \in \Phi_{ab}(H_1^\perp)$. A direct calculation shows that T_2 is injective, thus, T_2 is left invertible. From Theorem 1.5, it is clear that $\beta(T_2) = s\text{-}mul(T) = \text{ind}(T_2)$.

Sufficiency follows from Lemma 1.6 immediately.

Proposition 1.8. Let $T \in B(H)$. Then T is lower semi-Browder iff T can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$,

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{12} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim(H_2) < \infty$, T_1 is right invertible, T_2 is nilpotent, and $\alpha(T_1) = b.s.\text{-}mul(T) = \text{ind}(T)$.

Proof. Necessity. If T is lower semi-Browder, then we can assume $p = \text{des}(T) < \infty$. Denote $H_1 = R(T^p)$ and $H_2 = H_1^\perp$. Note that T^p is lower semi-Browder, so $\dim H_2 < \infty$. Let $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$, we have

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{12} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} : H_1 \oplus H_2 \rightarrow H_1 \oplus H_2.$$

That T_1 is surjective and $T_2^P = 0$ is evident. Note that $\dim H_2 < \infty$ implies $T_2 \in \Phi_b(H_2)$, it follows from Lemma 1.6 that $T_1 \in \Phi_{sb}(H_1)$, and so T_1 is right invertible. From Theorem 1.5, we have $\alpha(T_1) = \text{ind}(T_1) = \text{b.s. mul}(T)$.

Sufficiency follows from Lemma 1.6.

Combining Theorem 1.5, Propositions 1.7 and 1.8, we have the following theorem immediately.

Theorem 1.9. Let $T \in B(H)$. Then

- (1) T is a shift-like semi-Fredholm operator iff T is an upper semi-Browder operator.
- (2) T is a backward shift-like semi-Fredholm operator iff T is a lower semi-Browder operator.
- (3) T is a stationary semi-Fredholm operator iff T is a Browder operator.

2. APPLICATIONS OF SAMUEL MULTIPLICITIES

In ([8-12]), Fang studied Samuel multiplicities and presented some applications. In this section, by using Samuel multiplicities, we characterize the sets $\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_{ab}(M_C)$, $\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_{sb}(M_C)$ and $\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_b(M_C)$ completely, where $M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$ is a 2×2 upper triangular operator matrix defined on $H \oplus K$. For the study advances of 2×2 upper triangular operator matrix, see ([1-4], [13-19]).

First, note that if $T \in B(H)$, then T is bounded below iff T is left invertible, thus, Theorem 1 of [14] can be rewritten as follows:

Lemma 2.1 [14]. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$, M_C is left invertible for some $C \in B(K, H)$ iff A is left invertible and $\begin{cases} a(B) \leq \beta(A) & \text{if } R(B) \text{ is closed,} \\ \beta(A) = \infty & \text{if } R(B) \text{ is not closed.} \end{cases}$

Lemma 2.2 [4]. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$,

- (1) $\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma(M_C) = \sigma_l(A) \cup \sigma_r(B) \cup \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \alpha(B - \lambda) \neq \beta(A - \lambda)\}.$

One of the main results in this section is:

Theorem 2.3. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$, $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$ iff $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$ and

$$\begin{cases} s_mul(A) = \infty & \text{if } B \notin \Phi_+(K), \\ b.s._mul(B) \leq s_mul(A) & \text{if } B \in \Phi_+(K). \end{cases}$$

Proof. We first claim that if $B \notin \Phi_+(K)$, then

$$(2) \quad M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K) \text{ for some } C \in B(K, H) \Leftrightarrow A \in \Phi_{ab}(H) \text{ and } s_mul(A) = \infty.$$

To do this, suppose $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$. Then from Lemma 1.6 we have $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$. If $s_mul(A) < \infty$, then $A \in \Phi(H)$, since $\text{ind}(A) = \alpha(A) - \beta(A) = b.s._mul(A) - s_mul(A)$. Hence it is easy to show that $B \in \Phi_+(K)$, which is in a contradiction. Thus, $s_mul(A) = \infty$.

Conversely, suppose that $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$ and $s_mul(A) = \infty$, which implies $\beta(A) = \infty$. It follows from Proposition 1.7 that A can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim(H_1) < \infty$, A_1 is nilpotent, and A_2 is a left invertible operator. Noting that $\beta(A) = \infty$, we have $\beta(A_2) = \infty$. Hence it follows from Lemma 2.1 that there exists some $C_0 \in B(K, H_2)$ such that $\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & C_0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$ is left invertible. Now consider operator

$$M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & C_0 \\ 0 & 0 & B \end{pmatrix},$$

where $C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ C_0 \end{pmatrix} \in B(K, H)$. By Lemma 1.6, it is easy to check that $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$.

Next, We claim that if $B \in \Phi_+(K)$, then

$$(3) \quad M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K) \text{ for some } C \in B(K, H) \Leftrightarrow A \in \Phi_{ab}(H) \text{ and } b.s._mul(B) \leq s_mul(A).$$

To this end, suppose $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$, which implies $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$. By Proposition 1.8, we have that A can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim(H_1) < \infty$, A_1 is nilpotent, A_2 is a left invertible operator, and $\beta(A_2) = s_mul(A)$. Since the assumption that $B \in \Phi_+(K)$, using Theorem 1.5, we know that B can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $K = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3$

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & * & * \\ 0 & B_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 & B_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim K_3 < \infty$, B_1 is a right invertible operator, B_2 is a left invertible operator, B_3 is a finite, nilpotent operator, and the parts marked by $*$ can be any operators. Moreover, $\text{ind}(B_1) = \alpha(B_1) = b.s_mul(B)$, $\text{ind}(B_2) = -\beta(B_2) = -s_mul(B_1)$ and $\text{ind}(B) = \alpha(B_1) - \beta(B_2)$. Therefore, M_C can be rewritten as the following form

$$M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} & C_{11} & C_{12} & C_{13} \\ 0 & A_2 & C_{21} & C_{32} & C_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & B_1 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & B_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & B_3 \end{pmatrix} : H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3 \rightarrow H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3.$$

Noting that $\dim(H_1) < \infty$ and $\dim(K_3) < \infty$, we have $A_1 \in \Phi_b(H_1)$ and $B_3 \in \Phi_b(K_3)$. Consequently, Lemma 1.6 leads to

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & C_{21} & C_{32} \\ 0 & B_1 & * \\ 0 & 0 & B_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \Phi_{ab}(H_2 \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2),$$

which implies

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & C_{21} \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix} \in \Phi_{ab}(H_2 \oplus K_1).$$

Now we shall prove that

$$\beta(A_2) \geq \alpha(B_1).$$

If $\beta(A_2) = \infty$, the above inequality obviously holds. On the other hand, if $\beta(A_2) < \infty$, then $A_2 \in \Phi(H_2)$, and hence $B_1 \in \Phi_+(K_1)$. Thus,

$$0 \geq \text{ind}\left(\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & C_{21} \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \text{ind}(A_2) + \text{ind}(B_1) = -\beta(A_2) + \alpha(B_1),$$

that is,

$$\alpha(B_1) \leq \beta(A_2).$$

Therefore,

$$b.s.\text{-}mul(B) \leq s\text{-}mul(A).$$

Conversely, suppose $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$, $B \in \Phi_+(K)$ and $b.s.\text{-}mul(B) \leq s\text{-}mul(A)$. Similar to the above arguments, we have

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_2 \end{pmatrix} : H_1 \oplus H_2 \mapsto H_1 \oplus H_2$$

and

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & * & * \\ 0 & B_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 & B_3 \end{pmatrix} : K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3 \mapsto K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3,$$

where $\dim(H_1) < \infty$, A_1 is nilpotent, A_2 is a left invertible operator; $\dim K_3 < \infty$, B_1 is a right invertible operator, B_2 is a left invertible operator, B_3 is a finite, nilpotent operator, and the parts marked by $*$ can be any operators. Moreover, $\beta(A_2) = s\text{-}mul(A)$ and $\alpha(B_1) = b.s.\text{-}mul(B)$. Since the assumption that $b.s.\text{-}mul(B) \leq s\text{-}mul(A)$, we have $\alpha(B_1) \leq \beta(A_2)$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that there exists a left invertible operator $\tilde{C} \in B(K_1, H_2)$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & \tilde{C} \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix} \in B(H_2 \oplus K_1) \text{ is left invertible.}$$

Consider operator $M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} : H \oplus K \rightarrow H \oplus K$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & \tilde{C} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_1 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & B_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & B_3 \end{pmatrix} : H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3 \rightarrow H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3,$$

where $C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{C} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in B(K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3, H_1 \oplus H_2)$. Using Lemma 1.6, it is easy to see that $M_C \in \Phi_{ab}(H \oplus K)$.

By duality, we have

Theorem 2.4. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$, $M_C \in \Phi_{sb}(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$ iff $B \in \Phi_{sb}(K)$ and

$$\begin{cases} b.s.\text{-}mul(B) = \infty & \text{if } A \notin \Phi_-(H) \\ b.s.\text{-}mul(B) \geq s.mul(A) & \text{if } A \in \Phi_-(H) \end{cases}$$

From Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, we obtain the following two corollaries, concerning perturbations of the upper semi-Browder spectrum and lower semi-Browder spectrum, respectively.

Corollary 2.5. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$, we have

$$\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_{ab}(M_C) = \sigma_{ab}(A) \cup \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda \in \sigma_{SF+}(B) \text{ and } s.mul(A - \lambda) < \infty\} \cup$$

$$\{\lambda \in \Phi(A) \cap \Phi_+(B) : b.s.\text{-}mul(B - \lambda) > s.mul(A - \lambda)\}.$$

Corollary 2.6. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$, we have

$$\bigcap_{C \in B(K, H)} \sigma_{sb}(M_C) = \sigma_{sb}(B) \cup \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \lambda \in \sigma_{SF-}(A) \text{ and } b.s.\text{-}mul(B - \lambda) < \infty\} \cup$$

$$\{\lambda \in \Phi(B) \cap \Phi_-(A) : b.s.\text{-}mul(B - \lambda) < s.mul(A - \lambda)\}.$$

Theorem 2.7. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$, the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $M_C \in \Phi_b(H \oplus K)$ for some $C \in B(K, H)$;
- (2) $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$, $B \in \Phi_{sb}(K)$ and $b.s.\text{-}mul(B) = s.mul(A)$;
- (3) $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$, $B \in \Phi_{sb}(K)$ and $\alpha(A) + \alpha(B) = \beta(A) + \beta(B)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Suppose that $M_C \in \Phi_b(H \oplus K)$. Then from Lemma 1.6, we have $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$ and $B \in \Phi_{sb}(K)$. Using Propositions 1.7 and 1.8, we have

$$M_C = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} & C_{11} & C_{12} \\ 0 & A_2 & C_{21} & C_{32} \\ 0 & 0 & B_1 & B_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & B_2 \end{pmatrix} : H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2 \rightarrow H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus K_1 \oplus K_2,$$

where $\dim(H_1) < \infty$, A_1 is nilpotent, A_2 is a left invertible operator, $\dim K_2 < \infty$, B_1 is a right invertible operator, B_2 is a finite, nilpotent operator. Moreover,

$$\beta(A_2) = s.\text{mul}(A) \text{ and } \alpha(B_1) = b.s.\text{mul}(B).$$

In addition, it follows from Lemma 1.6 that

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & C_{21} \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix} \in \Phi_b(H_2 \oplus K_1).$$

Note the well-known fact that if $M_C \in \Phi(H \oplus K)$, then $A \in \Phi(H)$ if and only if $B \in \Phi(K)$. Thus, if $\beta(A_2) = \infty$, then $B_1 \notin \Phi(K_1)$, and so $\beta(A_2) = \alpha(B_1) = \infty$ since that B_1 is right invertible. Otherwise, if $\beta(A_2) < \infty$, then both A_2 and B_1 are Fredholm. Consequently,

$$0 = \text{ind}\left(\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & C_{21} \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \text{ind}(A_2) + \text{ind}(B_1) = -\beta(A_2) + \alpha(B_1),$$

that is, $\beta(A_2) = \alpha(B_1)$. Therefore, $s.\text{mul}(A) = b.s.\text{mul}(B)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). Suppose that $A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$, $B \in \Phi_{sb}(K)$ and that $s.\text{mul}(A) = b.s.\text{mul}(B)$. Then from Proposition 1.7 we have that A can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim(H_1) < \infty$, A_1 is nilpotent, and A_2 is a left invertible operator. By Proposition 1.8, $B \in B(K)$ can be decomposed into the following form with respect to some orthogonal decomposition $K = K_1 \oplus K_2$

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & B_{12} \\ 0 & B_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\dim(K_2) < \infty$, B_1 is a right invertible operator, and B_2 is nilpotent. Moreover, $s.\text{mul}(A) = \beta(A_2)$ and $b.s.\text{mul}(B) = \alpha(B_1)$. Since the assumption that $s.\text{mul}(A) = b.s.\text{mul}(B)$, $\alpha(B_1) = \beta(A_2)$. Thus, we conclude from Theorem 1.5 that there exists some

operator $C_{12} \in B(K_1, H_2)$ such that $\begin{pmatrix} A_2 & C_{21} \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix}$ is invertible. Define $C \in B(K, H)$ as follows:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ C_{12} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 1.6, it no hard to prove that $M_C \in \Phi_b(H \oplus K)$.

(2) \iff (3). For this, it is sufficient to prove that if

$A \in \Phi_{ab}(H)$ and $B \in \Phi_{sb}(K)$, then

$$\alpha(A) + \alpha(B) = \beta(A) + \beta(B) \text{ if and only if } b.s_mul(B) = s_mul(A),$$

which follows from Propositions 1.7 and 1.8 immediately. This completes the proof.

In [1], Cao has proved the equivalence of (1) and (3) of Theorem 2.7 by a different method, which seems to be more complicated.

The next corollary immediately follows from Theorem 2.7.

Corollary 2.8. For any given $A \in B(H)$ and $B \in B(K)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{C \in G(K, H)} \sigma_b(M_C) &= \sigma_{ab}(A) \cup \sigma_{sb}(B) \cup \\ &\quad \{\lambda \in \Phi_{ab}(A) \cap \Phi_{sb}(B) : b.s_mul(B - \lambda) \neq s_mul(A - \lambda)\} \\ &= \sigma_{ab}(A) \cup \sigma_{sb}(B) \cup \\ &\quad \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \alpha(A - \lambda) + \alpha(B - \lambda) \neq \beta(A - \lambda) + \beta(B - \lambda)\}. \end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] X. H. Cao. Browder spectra for upper triangular operator matrices, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 342(2008), 477-484.
- [2] X. L. Chen, S. F. Zhang, H. J. Zhong. On the filling in holes problem of operator matrices, Linear Algebra Appl., 430(2009) 558-563.
- [3] D. S. Djordjević. Perturbations of spectra of operator matrices, J. Operator Theory, 48(2002) 467-486.
- [4] H. K. Du, J. Pan. Perturbation of spectrums of 2×2 operator matrices, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 121(1994) 761-766.
- [5] J. Eschmeier. Samuel multiplicity and Fredholm theory, Math. Ann., 339 (2007) 21-35.
- [6] J. Eschmeier. On the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity of Fredholm tuples, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 56(2007) 1463-1477.
- [7] J. Eschmeier. Samuel multiplicity for several commuting operators, J. operator Theory, 60(2008) 399-414.
- [8] X. Fang. Samuel multiplicity and the structure of semi-Fredholm operators, Adv. Math., 186 (2) (2004) 411-437.
- [9] X. Fang. Hilbert polynomials and Arveson's curvature invariant, J. Funct. Anal., 198 (2) (2003) 445-464.

- [10] X. Fang. Invariant subspaces of the Dirichlet space and commutative algebra, J. Reine Angew. Math., 569 (2004) 189-211.
- [11] X. Fang. The Fredholm index of quotient Hilbert modules, Math. Res. Lett., 12 (2005) 911-920.
- [12] X. Fang. The Fredholm index of a pair of commuting operators, Geom. Funct. Anal., 16 (2006) 367-402.
- [13] J. K. Han, H. Y. Lee, W. Y. Lee. Invertible completions of 2×2 upper triangular operator matrices. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 128(1999) 119-123.
- [14] I. S. Hwang, W. Y. Lee. The boundedness below of 2×2 upper triangular operator matrices, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory, 39(2001) 267-276.
- [15] W. Y. Lee. Weyl's theorem for operator matrices, Integr. equ. oper. theory, 32(1998) 319-331.
- [16] W. Y. Lee. Weyl spectra of operator matrices, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 129(2000) 131-138.
- [17] S. F. Zhang, H. J. Zhong, Q. F. Jiang. Drazin spectrum of operator matrices on the Banach space, Linear Algebra Appl., 429(2008) 2067-2075.
- [18] S. F. Zhang, Z. Y. Wu, H. J. Zhong. Continuous spectrum, point spectrum and residual spectrum of operator matrices, Linear Algebra Appl., 433(2010) 653-661.
- [19] S. F. Zhang, H. J. Zhong, J. D. Wu. Spectra of Upper-triangular Operator Matrices, Acta Math. Sci. (in Chinese), 54(2011) 41-60.

(Shifang Zhang) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU 310027, P.R. CHINA,
SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, FUJIAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, FUZHOU 350007, CHINA
E-mail address: shifangzhangfj@163.com

(Junde Wu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU 310027, P R. CHINA
E-mail address: wjd@zju.edu.cn